

REMARKS

Summary

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 10-12, 14- 24. Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-12, 15-17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 14, 19 and 21-24 have been canceled, and claims 2-3, 5, 7-9, and 13 were previously canceled. Claims 25-28 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 3, lines 18-20, and 29-31, page 5, lines 23-25, page 6, lines 8-10, page 9, lines 11-14, page 10, lines 13-14, and Figures 7-10 and 13-14. No new matter has been added. Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1, 4, 6, 10-12, 15-18, 20, and 25-28, and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Telephonic Interview

Assignee thanks the Examiner, Jeffery B. Dennison, for the courtesies extended to Assignee's attorneys, Sumeet Magoon (reg. no. 43,769) and Robert Summers (reg. no. 57,844), during the telephonic interview that took place on November 7, 2007. During the interview, the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection of claim 1 was discussed, and Examiner Dennison agreed to withdraw the rejection and indicated that a non-final office action would follow as a result.

In addition, claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 28 and Ndili (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0161928 A1) were discussed.

Detailed Remarks

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action indicates that the Assignee's "specification does not disclose first or second viewable segments being viewable in the said display at the same time." Office Action at p. 3.

Assignee notes that Examiner Dennison agreed to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, during the telephonic interview held on November 7,

2007. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection of claim 1.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-12, 15-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ollikainen (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0074475 A1) in view of Ndili (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0161928 A1) (hereinafter the "Ollikainen-Ndili combination"). In view of the reasons noted below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 describes dividing a predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments. Claim 1 recites "said proxy server is further configured to generate said navigation aid" and "transmit said first viewable segment and said navigation aid in response to said request, said navigation aid being selectable with said wireless communication device to request said second viewable segment." The Office Action asserts that the combination of Ollikainen and Ndili shows all the limitations of claim 1. Even if the combination of Ollikainen and Ndili is proper, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not teach or suggest dividing a predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments. Moreover the combination does not teach or suggest generating a navigation aid or transmitting said navigation aid with said first viewable segment in response to said request.

Instead, Ollikainen is directed to a system that includes nodes that convert a file requested by a user from one type to another type. Ollikainen shows a user interface in Figures 5-6 and describes in ¶ 0052 a user interface connected to a common bus, which in turn transmits data to, and receives data from a switching matrix. In contrast to claim 1, Ollikainen does not teach or suggest generating a navigation aid or transmitting a navigation aid with a viewable segment. The Office Action concedes that Ollikainen does not describe dividing a mark-up language file into viewable segments. Office Action at p. 4. Ndili is directed to a device for delivering content to a mobile device from a network site where the system converts the network content into a wireless mark-up language. Ndili indicates, at ¶ 0078, that "the content retrieved from the IP site is converted and segmented according to the memory allotment. Each segment is

portioned to correspond approximately to the memory allotment.” Ndili, at Figure 4, illustrates that the last segment is determined in step 460. Ndili, in contrast to claim 1, does not teach or suggest dividing a predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments.

Ndili further discloses, at ¶¶ 0110 – 0113, that “instructions may appear as part of a display, or as user-interactive features such as icons.” Ndili does not teach or suggest a proxy server “configured to generate said navigation aid” or “configured to transmit said first viewable segment and said navigation aid in response to said request.” Instead, Ndili teaches that a next segment may be indicated with user-interactive feature (icon), and that the last segment is signaled to a mobile device. Ndili does not teach or suggest that the user-interactive feature (icon) is generated or transmitted by a proxy server with a segment. In contrast to Ndili, claim 1 recites “said navigation aid being selectable with said wireless communication device to request said second viewable segment.” Ndili does not teach or suggest generating or transmitting a navigation aid that is selectable to request a viewable segment. Therefore, in contrast to claim 1, neither Ndili nor Ollikainen, alone or in combination, describe a wireless communication system that includes a proxy server configured to divide said predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments, generate a navigation aid and transmit said navigation aid with a viewable segment, where said navigation aid is selectable to request a viewable segment. Claim 1, in clear contrast to Ndili alone or in combination with Ollikainen, describes such a wireless communication system. Thus, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of claim 1, from which dependent claims 4 and 26 depend.

In further contrast to claim 1, even if the Ollikainen-Ndili combination were interpreted to transmit a navigation aid with a viewable segment, the combination does not teach or suggest predetermining the number of viewable segments. Instead, the combination teaches that the last segment must be determined in order to know when to signal the last segment, as illustrated in Figure 4 at steps 460 and 470. Thus, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of claim 1, from which dependent claims 4 and 26 depend. Therefore, claims 1, 4 and 26 are patentable over the Ollikainen-Ndili combination.

Amended claim 6 recites "dividing said predetermined mark-up language file into a plurality of viewable segments, said plurality of viewable segments comprising a predetermined number of viewable segments," and "generating a navigation aid configured to direct retrieval of one of said plurality of viewable segments." Claim 6 further recites "transmitting said first viewable segment and said navigation aid to said wireless communication device." In contrast to claim 6, neither Ndili nor Ollikainen, alone or in combination, describe a method of retrieving mark-up language files that includes dividing a predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments, generating a navigation aid or transmitting a navigation aid with a viewable segment. Therefore, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of independent claim 6, from which dependent claim 10 depends. Thus, claims 6 and 10 are patentable over the Ollikainen-Ndili combination.

Amended claim 11 recites logic configured to receive a request to retrieve a predetermined mark-up language file residing on a remote server and separate a response into a predetermined number of viewable segments. Amended claim 11 further recites logic configured to "generate a navigation aid" and "transmit said first viewable segment and said navigation aid to said wireless communication device." In contrast to independent claim 11, neither Ndili nor Ollikainen, alone or in combination, describe a computer network for providing information to a wireless communication device that includes predetermining mark-up language files, separating a response into a predetermined number of viewable segments, generation of a navigation aid or transmission of a navigation aid to a wireless communication device with a viewable segment. Therefore, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of independent claim 11, from which dependent claim 12 depends. Thus, claims 11 and 12 are patentable over the Ollikainen-Ndili combination.

Amended claim 15 recites "said proxy server is configured to divide said predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments," and "generate a first navigation aid associated with said first viewable segment and a second navigation aid associated with said second viewable segment." Claim 15 further recites "said proxy server is further configured to transmit said first

viewable segment and said first navigation aid in response to said request.” In contrast to independent claim 15, neither Ndili nor Ollikainen, alone or in combination, describe a wireless communication system that includes a proxy server configured to divide said predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments, generate a navigation aid or transmit said navigation aid with a viewable segment to a wireless device. Therefore, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of independent claim 15, from which dependent claims 20 and 27 depend. Thus, claims 15, 20 and 27 are patentable over the Ollikainen-Ndili combination.

Amended claim 16 recites dividing a predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments, and “generating a first navigation aid and a second navigation aid configured to direct retrieval of said second viewable segment and said first viewable segment, respectively.” Claim 16 further recites “transmitting said first navigation aid and said first viewable segment to said wireless communication device.” In contrast to independent claim 16, neither Ndili nor Ollikainen, alone or in combination, describe a method of retrieving mark-up language files over a wireless communication network that includes dividing a predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments, and generating a first navigation aid and a second navigation aid or transmitting said first navigation aid with said first viewable segment to a wireless communication device. Therefore, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of independent claim 16. Thus, claim 16 is patentable over the Ollikainen-Ndili combination.

Amended claim 17 recites dividing with said proxy server said predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments and “generating a navigation aid configured to direct retrieval of said second viewable segment.” Claim 17 further recites “transmitting with said proxy server said navigation aid and said first viewable segment to said wireless communication device.” In contrast to independent claim 17, neither Ndili nor Ollikainen, alone or in combination, describe a method of retrieving mark-up language files over a wireless communication network that includes dividing with said proxy server said predetermined mark-up language file into a predetermined number of viewable segments and generating with a proxy server a

navigation aid and transmitting with the proxy server said navigation aid with a first viewable segment to said wireless communication device. Therefore, the Ollikainen-Ndili combination does not contain all the limitations of independent claim 17, from which dependent claims 18 and 25 depend. Thus, claims 17, 18 and 25 are patentable over the Ollikainen-Ndili combination.

For at least the previously discussed reasons, the combination of Ollikainen in view of Ndili does not teach or suggest each and every recited limitation, and independent claims 1, 6, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 28 are allowable. Dependent claims 4, 10, 12, 18, 20, and 25-27 are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Assignee also respectfully asserts that the limitations described in new claims 25-28 are also not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Assignee respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If for any reason the Application is not allowable, the examiner is requested to contact the Assignee's undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

**BRINKS
HOFER
GILSON
& LIONE**

Respectfully submitted,



Robert D. Summers Jr.
Registration No. 57,844
Attorney for Assignee

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
CUSTOMER NO. 33391
Telephone: (312) 321-4200
Facsimile: (312) 321-4299